UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/589,401 06/08/2007 | | Uwe Skultety-Betz | 10191/4512 | 8231 |
| 26646 KENYON & K | 7590 05/29/200 ENYON LLP | EXAMINER | | |
| ONE BROADY | | BYTHROW, PETER M | | |
| NEW YORK, N | N1 10004 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3662 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 05/29/2009 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|------------------|----------------------|--|
| 10/589,401 | SKULTETY-BETZ ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| Peter M. Bythrow | 3662 | |

| | Peter M. Bythrow | 3662 | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence add | ress | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>22 May 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. | | | | | | | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appel for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance | t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE f). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 | g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI 36(a) and the appropriat | on. LED WITHIN TWO e extension fee | | | | |
| under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat | nally set in the final Offic | e action; or (2) as | | | | |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | | | | | |
| The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet | nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); | ΓE below); | | | | | |
| appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a on NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | | | | | | |
| The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | <u> </u> | | | | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [| · | • | _ | | | | |
| how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | r be entered and an e. | xpianation of | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se | al and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1 | s to provide a). | | | | |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | | • | | | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu | | i condition for allowan | ce because: | | | | |
| 12. | F10/56/06) Paper No(s) | | | | | | |
| /Thomas H. Tarcza/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3662 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Application No.

New Issues:

Claim 18, as amended, recites "wherein a distance sensor is adapted to determine a distance traveled by the radar device as a function of a distance of movement of the radar device." This limitation appears to be a redundant statement, equating to "a distance traveled is determined based upon the distance traveled." The specification, specifically page 5 lines 15-21, does not further illuminate the intention or function of this limitation beyond having a sensor which determines a distance traveled by the radar device. As there is no written description disclosing these limitations the claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention

New Matter:

Claim 18, as amended, recites "wherein a distance sensor is adapted to determine a distance traveled by the radar device as a function of a distance of movement of the radar device." The claim appears to be stating a functional operation of the distance sensor in that it "determine[s] a distance traveled by the radar device as a function of a distance of movement of the radar device". The relevant portion of the specification, page 5 lines 15-21, does not further illustrate the operation or underlying functionality of the distance sensor, and therefore the limitation would be considered new matter.